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ABSTRACT
This paper offers an ethnographic exploration of the assertion of a ‘Barkindji style’ art: why this matters and to whom it matters. Focusing particularly on the Darling River area of Wilcannia and on the period from the 1980s to the present, the increasing interest in art-making by local Aboriginal people is considered. Through a dialogue with artists, artworks, and others, the work examines the changing form, design and content of art and the role of art in defining ideas of Barkindji Aboriginal culture and tradition. Invocations by key cultural brokers to produce work that is seen to ‘belong to us’ is explored in terms of the cultural, political, and personal work that this involves; particularly as this intersects with ideas of artistic freedoms versus artistic direction by cultural brokers. The paper discusses the personal considerations and tensions that come to bear in the processes connected with production of art and its making. In so doing, this paper engages with, and extends, the work of Tacon et al. (2003), Cooper (1994), Kleinert (1994) and Morphy (2001) as this pertains to art ‘styles’ and material culture from what is widely referred to as south-eastern Australia.
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The Aboriginal artists from Wilcannia and Broken Hill with whom I work consider their ‘art style’ and ‘art designs’ in localised (if not always clearly specified) ways and terms encapsulated by the phrase ‘ours is lines’. It is to the localised assertions of the particularity and importance of art style and content as an explicit and spoken sign of a unique identity that my work attends – a particularity embraced by many who identify as Barkindji and who either live and/or were born in Wilcannia. This paper is based on intensive work with five key artist informants and to a lesser extent with 30 other Barkindji artists from Wilcannia and nearby Broken Hill. Less intensive associations with the wider communities of Wilcannia and Broken Hill were part of daily life during the sixteen months I lived in Wilcannia during 2002 – 2004. In recognising the difficulty of extrapolating key informants’ views as being representative of the entire Barkindji peoples I emphasise that my work demonstrates, I believe, the influence that particular individuals have in communicating and co-ordinating a local commonality of ideas (Schwartz 1978; Morphy 2008). I demonstrate how making and discussing art shapes ideas of what Barkindji culture is seen and thought to be and, importantly, what it is not for Barkindji people who are from, and remain, strongly connected to Wilcannia.

In the late 1980s some Aboriginal children from Wilcannia in far western New South Wales were taken on a visit to the Australian Museum in Sydney. One of these children, Murray Butcher, a Barkindji Aboriginal man now in his early thirties recalls:

It was at that time when I seen them art works, there was a big movement for the Central Australian art, for the dot painting, an’ we were all school age stuff an’ I thought, ‘what about our art?’ Cos I knew dots wasn’t ours, an’ all that was written
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in books an’ that was about Central Australia art or Top End art or stuff like that – nuthin’ about the art around our region.

I am not suggesting that Murray’s recall or perhaps re-visioning of this event spawned a Barkindji style. As Kleinert has shown Barkindji peoples have maintained something of a continuous production of, most notably, incised and decorated wooden weapons (1994). However, Murray’s memory is potent and suggests a level of cognisance of the inattention accorded Aboriginal people from the south east in more general terms. Moreover, it shows an appreciation that certain kinds of Aboriginality were being viewed and indeed promoted in some quarters (in particular art worlds and tourism) as a valuable form of difference. It bears mention that around this time Australia was making ready for its bi-centennial celebrations where the idea of ‘traditional’ Aboriginal art figured strongly. The regional art of which Murray speaks alludes, in part, to the representational systems which Morphy describes as indigenous to much of the south east of Australia (Morphy 2001:339). These include the figurative and graphic incised, stencilled and painted rock sites of the area. In these systems ‘the geometric element is predominant, with diamond patterns and curvilinear forms interspersed with oblongs, squares and oval features… [T]he art of the southeast shares in common with the art of the centre the repeated outlining of the form of the central features’ (Morphy 2001:339). Kleinert also refers to the distinctive design elements of south east NSW which were initially a feature of the elaborately carved and incised weapons, displaying ‘cross-hatching, herring-bone, chevrons, zigzags, diamonds, and rhomboids – used in conjunction with an equally rich array of figurative imagery’ (2000:241) (See Image 1.).

Cooper states that ‘[two] hundred years ago the Aborigines who inhabited the southeastern region of Australia channelled considerable creative force into the production of striking linear designs (1994:91). She cites evidence of these designs as being found primarily on ‘nineteenth-century wooden weapons’ which are now held in private and museum
collections, mentioned in written accounts, and seen in photographs of ‘ceremonial ground
drawings, corroboree sculptures, and patterns of cicatrisation and body painting’ (Cooper
1994:91). ‘It is these designs which characterize and distinguish the traditional visual cul-
ture of the area’ (Cooper 1994:91).

The area of south eastern Australia cited by Cooper is generally defined as taking in
Victoria, most of New South Wales, south west Queensland and the south-east of South
Australia (Cooper 1994; Peterson 1976). Whilst this broad brush geographic approach has
its roots in identifying those parts of Australia where Aboriginal people first felt the impact
of colonisation, it continues to be useful in facilitating comparison and generalisation about
the art of the region and the implication of that process for its inhabitants. While the entire
region of the south- east shows similarity ‘among its religious, social and material cultures’
(Cooper 1994:92, cf. Peterson 1976) and evidence ‘points to a distinctive and unified art
tradition overlying the existence of more localised styles’, the importance of the local in
matters of identity is shown to be salient giving different impetus to cultural life and codes
(Beckett 2005; Goodall 1982; Kleinert 1994). Indeed, as Jones and Hill-Burnett argue much
of the literature dealing with ‘traditional and ‘modern-day rural settlements…emphasizes
the importance of local traditions’ demonstrating that the local is more important than any
group-wide loyalties (1982:218). In terms of an art tradition Aboriginal people in Wilcannia
and more widely are faced with something of a quandary, it seems, as they attempt to
manoeuvre between internal and external political, economic and cultural forces and con-
siderations which variously require and/or promote the demonstration of more localised and
continuous traditions versus those geared towards a more united and cohesive pan-Aborigi-
nal identification (Jones and Hill-Burnett 1982). Before attending to the social effects and
affective resonances of these forces and considerations I offer some historical background
to Wilcannia arts production and practice.

SIGNS OF ART IN WILCANNIA FROM THE 1980S

From the mid-eighties there was ‘…growing recognition that in many parts of Australia,
cultural production provides the only means to improve economic status’ (Altman
1989:123). Art-making featured strongly here as a way of providing income and as a valued
demonstration of Aboriginal culture writ large. The conflation of Aboriginal art and culture
is one which has been increasingly articulated in the public sphere following the state spon-
sored linking of these categories in government funded initiatives (Altman 1989; Myers
2001, 2002). The Community Development Employment Programme (CDEP) in Wilcan-
nia provides an example of the bringing together of Aboriginal art, culture and work. Here,
Aboriginal people, irrespective of what may be considered skill or talent in this field, can
choose to ‘work’ at making art with the aim of creating sustainable employment. The very
fact that art is offered as a standard work pathway points to the assumption that ‘Aborigines
make art’. It is important to realise that through policies such as those instituted by govern-
ment in the late 1980s Aboriginal culture becomes something which can be specified and in
many ways must be made more concretely identifiable in order for it to be taught, practised
and sold. However, whilst ‘art and culture’ of the ‘Western and Central Desert and the ‘Top
End’ was a particular focus of government from the early 1970s, it was not until the late
1980s that Wilcannia came on to the government funding radar.

In 1987, an inaugural Aboriginal Arts and Craft Centre began operating out of what
had until then been an amusements arcade (the ‘old fun parlour’) in Reid Street Wilcannia.
This centre, funded by the Department of Education Employment Training and Youth
Affairs (DEETYA), and managed by the Local Aboriginal Land Council (LALC), was
known locally as the ‘Kaathiri’ (boomerang) art centre. Kaathiri closed (according to the
best estimates of people in town) around 1991. It is difficult to trace what caused this clo-
sure as all associated records were lost in a fire (or as one white local put it, ‘they were
torched’). There were about five Aboriginal people associated with the running of this centre. One of these, Murray Butcher, recalled that the art work made at Kaathiri included carved shields, boomerangs, spears and coasters made out of mulga wood, bowls made of red gum, bark paintings made with river red gum with maybe a ‘little blackfella’ or ‘welcome to Wilcannia’ painted on them, didgeridoos made out of mallee wood and bundis (women’s digging sticks). Poker work was a popular design tool as it was in other locations where pastoral work was present (Kleinert 1994:202). Painted quandong, kurrajongs and acacia seeds and ‘porcupine’ quills were used to make necklaces, earrings and trinkets. Acrylic painting on canvas board and masonite also began to increase in use at this time.

Following Kaathiri the local CDEP known as Ngarpa (working together) opened the Parntu (cod) Art Centre. This centre, known colloquially as the ‘the old Mobil’, started around 1995 and was housed in an old petrol station located on the main drag through to Broken Hill. According to current CDEP administrators the old Mobil was funded by DEETYA under a ‘Work Australia’ job skills programme. Unlike Kaathiri, the old Mobil was not purely an art and craft centre. The centre employed a non-Aboriginal horticulturist who encouraged the creation of a permaculture garden which included fruit trees, vegetables, ducks and geese. There is a sense that this centre was intended to be a more holistic cultural endeavour underwritten by notions of an Aboriginal ‘gemeinschaft’ of co-operation in line with the widely promulgated notion of a pan Aboriginal caring and sharing ethic. This centre closed around 1997 but, again, the exact dates are not clear as the records of this centre have also been lost. Reasons offered for the closure vary but of Aboriginal people I spoke with most suggest that the white manager who was a motivator and mentor left town and without this man’s influence and enthusiasm people just lost interest. This was coupled with some town children breaking into the centre and dispatching the ducks and geese.

In 2002, the then new proprietor of ‘The Wilcannia Motel’ began to sell art produced by local Aboriginal people. This was mostly paintings on canvas and board; to a lesser extent emu eggs (painted), and carved wooden artefacts such as boomerangs and clap sticks. These were offered for sale to clients of the motel and other members of the public including a largely transient white workforce. This man, who is committed to ‘furthering interest in art in Wilcannia’, continues to freely provide art materials to Aboriginal people who wish to paint. He then negotiates a price for completed works that are offered to him for sale. Some of the works he keeps for his own collection and others he sells (at no profit). As at 2008, the motel remains the main outlet for the sale of artworks by Wilcannia artists. In 2006, the Wilcannia motel owner who is a member of the Wilcannia Arts Committee (comprising three non-Aboriginal members) was successful in gaining funding through Regional Arts NSW for a three year artist in residence programme mooted as a model approach to the development of Indigenous arts. This programme is run out of the old Unit- ing Church hall, a fibro building which the Wilcannia Arts Committee has renovated in con- junction with the local CDEP as an ‘art space’. At time of writing, this space is only opened during the four yearly artists in residence programme as the arts committee feel that the space should be run by Aboriginal people on a volunteer basis. According to the committee there is currently no-one willing to take on this role and they reject the idea that this role should be remunerated. Apart from this art space, Wilcannia has one small art gallery – ‘The Old Fuel Store’ which opens once a week on a Thursday for about four hours. While a handful of local Aboriginal works are displayed here, for the most part, the gallery displays the art work of the non-Aboriginal owner who is also a member of the Wilcannia Arts Com- mittee. The town of Wilcannia has neither benefited nor suffered (depending on one’s view- point) from the presence of an art co-ordinator. Indeed, one of the more interesting aspects of art making in Wilcannia is that art continues to be widely made despite the historic, current and relative paucity of the kinds of resources and interest accorded artists from what are regarded to be the more ‘remote’ centres of Aboriginal Australia.
INCREASING AWARENESS AND ARTICULATIONS OF STYLE

Following the opening of Kaathiri in 1987, the state government funded a visit to Alice Springs by two Wilcannia artists to see what was happening in the art scene there. One of these artists told me that on their return, ‘a rush of dot painting’ ensued. This is said to have been short lived and due, at least in part, to certain Barkindji individuals beginning to impress upon people that ‘dots’ were ‘not from here’, that dots ‘do not belong to us’ and are ‘not Barkindji’. This increased awareness, or at least overt and explicit articulation of what belongs to ‘us’ followed a burgeoning Aboriginal political engagement from the mid-1970s onwards (Beckett 2005:16-18). The push towards Aboriginal-designated positions related to ‘Aboriginal cultural heritage’, particularly in the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS), saw many Aboriginal people in NSW gain increased (if not in some cases their first) access to cultural heritage sites around the state. Concomitantly, people in the area began to gain access to anthropological, historical and archaeological information that had been hitherto more difficult to access or not widely known. This saw a shift in the ways people began to think about and explicate what it is to be Aboriginal. Indeed, the political climate since the 1970s has exponentially demanded a greater reflexivity and a bringing to consciousness of what is seen to constitute cultural knowledge (Correy 2004; Merlan 1989, 2005; Povinelli 1993, 2002). This awareness reached something of a peak for Barkindji Aboriginal people during the long period of negotiations for the hand-back of Mutawintji National Park to the traditional owners from 1989 until its success in 1998.

DISCREPANT RECOLLECTIONS

There is little physical evidence of there having been any painters in Wilcannia prior to the late 1970s. A few examples of acrylic paintings estimated to be from the late seventies and eighties are stacked against the walls of a privately owned and now vacant building which was at that time a public house. An adjoining residence owned by the same person has some acrylic paintings and carved boomerangs displayed on the walls. In total there are about a dozen or so (acrylic and gloss house paint) paintings on masonite, plywood and canvas board which were traded with the publican for alcohol or cash.

When I asked some of the older Aboriginal people what they remembered of painting and carving before the art centres opened, many went on to talk of an uncle or another (mostly male) relative who had carved wooden artefacts for sale. Aboriginal people told me that items such as carved and incised boomerangs, nulla nullas (clubs), spears, shields and stock whips, carved emu eggs, feather flowers, jewellery made out of various nuts, seeds and mussel shells were made for sale as ‘souvenirs’ and ‘trinkets’ prior to the eighties (cf. Kleinert 1994). Physical and verbal evidence shows that some material culture known more readily today as (variously) art or artefacts and previously known as artefacts, crafts, souvenirs and trinkets were being made in Wilcannia prior to the government policies of the 1970s which encouraged art-making. Indeed, in the recollections and imagination of many Aboriginal people today many of these objects have been produced for as long as they can remember. Some exceptions are feather flowers and stock whips which do not seem to be made any longer, the latter having lost their utility and demand with the demise of the Aboriginal pastoral industry (cf. Kleinert 1994), and the passing of those involved. Aboriginal people in Wilcannia recognise that the production of acrylic paintings and other art forms such as lino cuts are a more recent phenomenon. They also recognise that all kinds of previously made objects now associated with Aboriginal art have markedly increased in production as opposed to ‘before’. People nevertheless state that carved bowls, boomerangs, nulla nullas, spears, shields and carved emu eggs have ‘always been made’ – a claim which must be considered in light of the focus and position given to Aboriginal art in recent decades.

Aboriginal recollections of art production do not tally with those of most non-Aborigi-
nal people with whom I interacted. I asked a local non Aboriginal artist who has lived in Wilcannia on and off for the last sixteen years, if she remembered any of the old people making art works. She said she could not even remember any of ‘the old people whittling wood’. This is clearly contra the memories of many Aboriginal people. It is certainly also contra the situation described by Kleinert from the late eighteen-hundreds to nineteen seventy five where, she argues, Barkindji people as well as others in settled NSW have demonstrated a continuity of cultural form, content and meaning through (in particular) the production of carved and incised wooden artefacts and emu eggs (1994). That non-Aboriginal people in Wilcannia prior to the late eighties were not generally aware of the extent of the production and/or the sale of objects now refashioned as art objects could say something about the stringent physical and relational distance historically observed (indeed at times expected and demanded by whites) between black and white people in Wilcannia (cf. Kleinert 1994:187). Despite Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal discrepancies about the level and presence of art production, all agree it was not substantial. What is clear is that Aboriginal people in Wilcannia, and in the nearby town of Broken Hill 200 kilometres further west, have increasingly if somewhat spasmodically produced art works on paper, canvas and board over the past two decades with a marked increase since the early 2000s. The latter date can in part be assumed to owe something to the availability of art materials and a ready market in the Wilcannia Motel. The more recent availability of inexpensive art materials from craft shops in Broken Hill and the introduction of a council run bus service to this destination has also contributed to making painting a more readily accessible practice. For Barkindji Aboriginal people in Wilcannia and Broken Hill, there can be no argument that art has become a recognised vehicle for demonstrating continuity of practices and ‘traditions’. Yet this, as we shall see, is not without its own tensions.

ARTISTS, ART AND CULTURE – A MEANINGFUL LIAISON

At least three of the Barkindji artists I worked with, Badger Bates, Phillip Bates and Murray Butcher have had access to the artefacts from the Wilcannia region held in the Australian Museum collection in Sydney. For Phillip and Murray this occurred in their youth whilst Badger was in his thirties. Whilst it is clear from their recollections that these visits had a significant impact, it would be incorrect to think that this was their first encounter with some of these forms or designs.

Badger

Badger, now sixty years of age worked as a Cultural Sites Officer with National Parks and Wildlife from 1983 until he retired in 2005. His partnering with a white archaeologist (Aboriginalist), together with a particular upbringing and gregarious disposition makes Badger something of a special case which has bearing on his role as an influential cultural broker. Reared by his granny Annie Moisey a well known Gurnu speaking Barkindji matriarch and ‘clever woman’ (Beckett 1958:56), Badger spent much of his childhood travelling up and down the Warrego, Paroo and Darling Rivers as a child (cf. Hardy 1976:162) spending time with various Barkindji groups. It was from granny and others that, as a young boy of about eight years old, Badger learned to carve emu eggs and wooden artefacts. However, the designs he was taught by granny resonated at a different level for him when he joined National Parks. It was then he saw the rock engravings, paintings and stencils from Mutawintji National Park for the first time. It was also around this time that he went to the Australian Museum in Sydney and saw the wooden artefacts which bore some of the same designs he had been taught by granny. ‘I just felt proud in my mind I knew it through what granny taught me’. While Badger knew some of these designs from his granny he began to draw on new and more complex aspects and amalgamations of these designs and the figura-
tive work from paintings and engravings on the rock and caves at Mutawintji National Park, Mount Manara and Euriowie (Martin 1996). These sites are all at different levels connected with Barkindji historically and contemporaneously. These are connections which become manifest in different forms and contexts across time as the meanings and meaningfulness of these sites are re-connected to a wider group of Barkindji.

**Phillip**

Phillip, Badger’s son now in his late thirties and also an artist visited the Australian Museum on a school excursion as a young boy. He told me, ‘I seen some stuff there. Yeah. Like the people we was with, they showed – sorta said – this your people here, an’ that. An’ we had a couple of our elders from home with us an’ they was telling us, you know, this our mob here, ‘n things’. Phillip remembers the shields, boomerangs and spears that he saw and recalls that ‘it was a good buzz’ to see his people’s work. Prior to becoming a painter in the early 1990s, Phillip was taught to carve wooden artefacts by his father. When Phillip starting painting he said that he ’started out doin’ dot paintings for a while an’ then Dad explained, you know, that’s not our culture to do dot painting.

**Murray**

Murray Butcher, a contemporary of Phillip Bates is, like Badger, something of a special case. Murray was reared by his ‘nan’ Elsie Jones, whose ‘brilliant knowledge of [Barkindji] vocabulary’ was, according to the linguist Luise Hercus instrumental in her being able to formulate the Paakantyi Dictionary (1993:2). Elsie reared Murray until her death in 1996 instilling in him the importance of Barkindji language and what she knew of Barkindji ways. Both Elsie and Granny Moisey remain as cultural touchstones and sources of cultural process and knowledge for Aboriginal people and anthropologists alike; vicariously through text and in more embodied terms through their descendents knowledge and memories of practices, sites, stories and song. However, the point to be made here is that these upbringings, and these circumstances have, together, with a reflexive politics of Aboriginal culture concatenated to develop newer, more objectivised and more reflexively complex understandings of cultural production. People such as Badger and Murray are more informed as it were on the historic styles of Darling River area objects. Their personal histories have facilitated greater interaction with archaeological art sites and they demonstrate this closer awareness through their art work. Importantly, both are active disseminators of cultural knowledge through art making and dialogue with both black and white. For Badger this occurs through formal and remunerated art and culture workshops and exhibitions. His previous role as a cultural heritage officer and his personality as a charismatic and gregarious man all contribute to his influence. As someone seen to ‘know about culture’ and to have inherited the ‘special powers’ of his Granny, Badger is popular and comfortable with both black and white. Murray, on the other hand, is something of a reluctant cultural broker. As one of the few remaining Barkindji speakers with any degree of fluency he is called upon in his role as an Aboriginal education Officer at Wilcannia Central high school to provide Aboriginal cultural content and cultural responses to matters of curriculum and protocol. He is, moreover, asked to be the Aboriginal public face of the school at various cultural events or instances perceived to require Aboriginal cultural content. Unlike Badger, Murray is embarrassed by public affirmation and is constantly expressing that the ‘Elders’ should be the ones who are given these roles and the associated status. He is however a willing and fairly tireless teacher of Barkindji cultural history to other Barkindji people. Despite Murray’s reluctance, both he and Badger are identified and recognised by both white and black as being culturally knowledgeable men with the authority to speak on ‘cultural matters’.
I asked Murray, ‘When you’re painting, what sort of, what do you paint about? What sort of subjects do you use? Do you tend to do the same things?’ He replied that:

[W]e do Aboriginal style story an’ that there. Cos we was told we wasn’t dot people, that’s not our tribe. An’ I remember sittin an’ askin’ Nan: what sorta art we do, ya know? An’ she said we do sort of stick art like little stick figures, an’ do tracks an’ stuff. We do lines an’ sometimes we do little spots an’ that y’know? Ahmm, we don’t do dots like out on, like them desert fullas do their paintins. So I try to stick to lines.

That Barkindji ‘do lines’ is a kind of mantra for artists who have spent any time with Badger Bates and Murray Butcher. Although nearly thirty years separates these two men, in this regard and in many matters pertaining to Barkindji ‘culture’ these two men in particular can be considered primary ‘cultural brokers’. Both express and live a determination to see ‘Barkindji culture’ (as they each explicitly articulate this) flourish. Art is seen to be an instrument of, and instrumental to, this task. Their assertion of a ‘Barkindji style art’ signifies Barkindji difference as well as uniqueness and is an explicit visual and verbal articulation in relation to, (as Murray says), ‘who we still are’. The emphasis on continuity here responds to accounts which operate to deny Barkindji and (more generally) Aboriginal people from settled Australia any recognisably valued form of Aboriginal culture. It can also be considered a response to a changed environment where Aboriginality has, particularly in art, become valued. This has encouraged signs and expressions of Aboriginality and perceptions of Aboriginal tradition. The association between specific Barkindji designs and identity was relayed to me by many local artists, and they in turn relayed to others that figures such as Murray Butcher or Badger Bates say, ‘we do lines’ – ‘we don’t do dots’. Other Barkindji people who are not artists seek what must be considered some form of cultural affirmation from these same ‘authoritative’ figures. They articulate that ‘lines’ are part of a ‘Barkindji style’, asking of Badger, Murray and others, ‘ours is lines unna’, Une? These kinds of questions are prompted by (in particular) Badger’s presence and whether the context is art-related or not, although my own presence as someone known to be interested in art cannot be discounted as a prompt. Through people such as Badger and Murray the ‘lines’ mantra has become such for artists and non-artists alike.

Whilst ‘doing lines’ is an explicit statement of identity and indeed is present in all art works to the extent that line is a necessary part of most art work on board or canvas, it would be incorrect to say that a clear Barkindji style that is immediately identifiable or that displays a coherent and agreed system of elements is present as in, for example, Yolgnu or Warlpiri art (Kleinert 2000; Morphy 2001, 2008; Munn 1973). On the other hand, the constancy of geometric elements and infill is fairly consistent as is the use of particular content which I discuss later. Then again, in terms of a Barkindji style, I am here much more concerned with how Barkindji seek to convey and express a Barkindji style and its meaning; the influence of certain cultural brokers in distributing the relationship between form and meaning; the articulated uptake and recognition of this, and the meaningfulness to those concerned. The statement ‘ours is lines’ is perhaps best thought a verbal articulation which seeks to identify something unique to Barkindji and their art. To say that ‘ours is lines’ and to know that ‘ours is lines’ when making art works can be considered as culturally and affectively meaningful irrespective of whether one uses lines in any coherent and recognisably characteristic way. Indeed, as previously mentioned ‘ours is lines’ is an assertion by non-artists every bit as much as it is by artists. Artists assert that it is important that they ‘do what belong to us’ – what they own. That they do not own dots and do not do dots or ‘not too many dots’ offers some argument for a Barkindji style art. At its most basic level,
Barkindji art in Wilcannia and indeed nearby Broken Hill is the absence of dots in art work by those who have been privy to the teaching of people such as Badger and Murray, and, who are interested in doing art that articulates this particular identity. But it is also more than this.

FLOWING LINES, THE RIVER AND IDENTITY

Cogently present in Barkindji art works is the repetitive outlining of form which Morphy describes as being characteristic of the south east as well as the Centre (Morphy 2001:339). In the Barkindji case, identifiable geometric designs are often used as background and infill for a range of motifs and features including the figurative. These take in animal tracks, landforms and sites, weapons and tools (historic) and animal life of the Darling River area. The most common themes are the Darling River itself and associated rivers and lakes (The Paroo and Warrego Rivers and Lake Woychucca); Barkindji people (including mythic, historic and living); ancestral beings (most specifically) Ngatji (The Rainbow Serpent); native freshwater fish and river turtles, goannas, and the two moiety ‘totems’ of kangaroo and emu. (See Images 2 and 3). This use of subject matter reflects that cited in Tacon et al.’s (2003:98) study of motifs from ‘south east Australia’ on Aboriginal wooden artifacts c1850-1970. This study considers that most subject matter ‘from each region continued to be animals, important to the people and associated with their traditional lands, scenes of traditional activity and indigenous artifacts’ (2003:98).


Although scholars refer to the infilling of motifs and designs as having significance, this significance and its meaning, according to Morphy is not known (2001:340). Nevertheless, as Kleinert states the graphic elements on ‘rock art, carved wooden weapons, possum skin cloaks, carved trees (dendroglyhs), cicatrices, and body designs of the region, [south east Australia] make it likely that these graphic elements encoded restricted knowledge as they do elsewhere in Aboriginal communities today’ (2000:241). While most Barkindji do not as a whole assert agreed specific meaning to the graphic elements used in designs, according to some Barkindji people, the free flowing and repetitive lines within and around an element are said by some to represent flowing rivers and creeks through their directional
use and shape as well as flowing water more generally. Phillip Bates talks of how he ‘learnt how to do all my people’s designs, you know, like river people an’ that’. This reference to the river concerns the relationship of the Barkindji people to the Barka (the Darling River). According to Hercus, Barkindji means ‘belonging to the river’ (1993: 3). This is a relationship made explicit through statements such as ‘we are Barka’ and ‘without the river we are nothing…we have no identity’. This connection to the Barka and its significance for art designs and content is cogent. In some sense all Barkindji art can be considered to be river related since humans, animals and the land are expressed to be connected to this vital life source and to each other. In another sense, water and its connection to Barkindji culture can be seen as something of an imperative at a time when access to water in the Murray Darling Basin and more generally is on the National agenda as perhaps never before. At a time when those on the Darling River at Wilcannia are experiencing and seeing change to their way of life as a result of reduced water flow, there is argument for a sense of urgency that requires Barkindji to articulate these kinds of explicit connections. These may, at once, be brought to greater consciousness and view through art. Overt concern for the river and its ecological condition is expressed through works such as ‘No More Catfish’ (See Image 4) and ‘Barka in Trouble’.

Free flowing and curvilinear lines within and around a motif are also expressed by some to represent ‘the Darlin’, ‘the river’ (see Image 5). One senior artist posits that he doesn’t know whether ‘it’s because of the river, we respect the river so much that we put wavy lines in to represent water and creeks and stuff’. However, country in general which has no rivers and creeks is also sometimes depicted with wavy lines which one artist says ‘just come natural to us’ (cf Kapferer 1988:ch.6.). This interpretation is an explicit signal at the cultural and political level of the importance of the Barkindji/Barka relationship to life and for identity as expressed.
A ‘natural’ feeling for water as line represented in and through art works is however not natural for every Barkindji artist. Much of the art work that is made uses a combination of styles and designs from different language groups and locations to which people have had either physical or visual access ‘often amalgamating elements from several different styles within a single work’ (Sutton 1988:20). However, the importance of articulating a particular Barkindji style for cultural brokers becomes evident in the corrective and pedagogic stress that certain people put on defining what is and what is not Barkindji to artists and others. For example, lines are Barkindji, ‘dots’ and ‘dolphins’ and ‘turtles with fins’ are not. This was made clear to a group of people who were making art as part of the CDEP. On one occasion Badger came to see how the group was doing. One of the artists (a woman in her mid-twenties) was painting a turtle. She had drawn the turtle with fins and Badger said to her, ‘our turtles have claws’, explaining that fins are for ‘top end’ saltwater turtles. He then drew the claws of a freshwater Darling River turtle for her. Whether this artist, a Barkindji woman in her mid-twenties, has seen or experienced a freshwater turtle in the river I do not know, perhaps she had not as the river at Wilcannia no longer sees an abundance of freshwater turtles. Perhaps she had seen a turtle and had not observed claws. Perhaps she did not consider this difference important to her work. She now, however, paints her turtles with claws and passes this information on to others, ‘Uncle Badger says….’. This offers but one example of a cultural broker’s influence and successful dissemination of what is considered his superior knowledge in matters thought of as specifically cultural.

A similar incident concerned the painting of a goanna. One of the younger artists in Wilcannia had painted a goanna with four claws equally spaced and straight. Badger explained to him that goannas have five claws and they are not straight. He held his wrists almost at right angles to one another and then crossed his forearms. He said this is how the claws look and then proceeded to mimic how the goanna climbs a tree. The artist has taken this on board and tells people of how Uncle Badger showed him how to draw goannas properly. Both of these examples might elicit a ‘so what’ response. What does it matter if goannas have the right number of claws in the right direction, and whether turtles are of the fresh or saltwater variety when depicted in art? Isn’t stylistic artistic licence part of being an artist? It matters because it is important to the person ‘teaching’, to the willing ‘pupils’, and to the extent that this knowledge is valued and drawn upon. It matters because art in the case of certain artists and in certain contexts is not so much about proclaiming ‘difference’ as proclaiming and claiming some coherent sense of cultural identity. What is grasped and what is rejected becomes important. Whether one sees this advice by cultural brokers as the successful dissemination of an idealised Barkindji style or as a form of coercion is difficult to discern.

CONFORMING TO IDEALS

There is no doubt that the influence of certain artists such as Murray Butcher and Badger Bates has a strong influence on Wilcannia art-making. Although artists are not expressly prohibited from creating what they like in terms of form, content and style, there is a strong and explicit desire to learn from people who are said to be culturally knowledgeable about ‘what is ours’, what is Barkindji. There is, moreover, at some level a tacit understanding that certain Barkindji artists, certain styles and content reflect degrees of Barkindji cultural knowledge: these are in turn linked to levels of cultural authority. What is painted or created, who makes it and the way it is made come together to reflect this knowledge and authority in a circular feedback process.

There are few intra-cultural Barkindji sanctions in Wilcannia or Broken Hill in terms of what one is permitted to paint and indeed what one is obliged to paint (Morphy 2008; Myers 1991; Sutton 1988:20). Yet, this is not to say that pressure to make art works which ‘conform’ to the various established ideals regarding what is, or what is not, a ‘valid’ and ‘true’ subject for an art work (by a Barkindji person) is not created by Aboriginal and non-
Aboriginal people alike. These pressures can in turn be seen to demand as well as to affect a validating relationship between the works, the people making the works and Aboriginal culture as imagined, expressed and lived. These pressures can come from within the community or without as well as from within the self.

In 2003 I attended an end of year TAFE art exhibition at Broken Hill which displayed the work of students completing the ‘Certificate II in Aboriginal Arts and Cultural Practices’. One of the female students, a Barkindji woman from Wilcannia showed me one of her works in the exhibition. She said that her teacher, a Sydney fine arts graduate who identifies as a ‘Koori’ asked her why she had painted a frill necked-lizard infilled with geometric designs. When she answered ‘cos I’m a blackfella’. The teacher responded by saying ‘that’s not good enough’.

I spoke to this teacher later about the importance of subject matter and style. His feeling is that, ‘Indigenous artists have a moral and ethical responsibility to produce art from the area’. He said he is trying to get students to understand that the, ‘traditional community does not exist anymore’. It is ‘fine to reproduce animal life and traditional stories’ but he wants students to ask ‘what relationship do I have to a traditional story today…how can rock engravings be re-interpreted and put into painting, what is the relationship?’ Over the past decade, Aboriginal arts practice as a category has become part of institutionalised teaching in the region. The TAFE teacher’s Aboriginality and his formal fine arts training, practice and values are part of the regional art world and are thrown into the mix with those of others such as Badger Bates and Murray Butcher. There appears to be little room in the teacher’s view for a strategic essentialism or the view that certain forms and content ‘come natural to us’.

There is also some ambivalence for Barkindji people between the desire to express a unique and group identity through Barkindji art and the desire to express innovation and individuality. As Holland and Lave (2001:27) suggest, ‘people struggling in the name of one identity are doing so in ways that at the same time involve other kinds of identities’. One artist whose work is well known in the region expresses this dilemma in saying; ‘I don’t wanna do fucken borin’ snakes and goannas all the time’. This statement speaks to perceived artistic restrictions. In a real sense many Aboriginal people feel that they ought to produce certain subjects in their art in order for the art, and indeed themselves to be considered Aboriginal in certain terms. This is something of a double bind and a double burden. Much scholarship has focused on normative statements about the group, about tradition, and about a collective aesthetic instead of what is specific and individual (Berlo 1999:178). In this regard there is an ambivalence between perpetuating some form of unique ‘Aboriginal’ and ‘Barkindji’ tradition and creativity and having the freedom to create ‘art’ that is not ‘recognisably’ or ‘acceptably’ Aboriginal and/or Barkindji in the public and art world domain. This raises broader questions about perceptions of art and artists that I address elsewhere (Gibson 2006).

ARTISTIC DEPICTIONS AND THEIR CHANGING INTERPRETATIONS

The carving of emu eggs is expressed as being a pursuit which has been undertaken by both men and women for as long as most can remember. The changing depictions on emu eggs serve as a vehicle to understanding how artistic cultural production has been subject to rethinking across time and changing political circumstance. Some families in Wilcannia and nearby Broken Hill and Menindee have emu eggs which they say were carved by family members prior to the late 1970s. These eggs depict a range of subjects, from those associated with the pastoral industry such as cowboy-type figures on bucking broncos, to figurative depictions such as male and female hunting scenes, male and female heads in profile, and native animals. The ‘hunting’ or ‘gathering’ scenes are mostly depicted in ‘historic’ form; that is, the men wear ‘lap laps’ and the women are bare breasted.
Sarah Martin, writing about an unspecified period post settlement and prior to 1992, comments that ‘[m]ost emu egg carvers depicted European influenced scenes or motifs, including bucking horses, native animals, or depictions of the ‘noble savage’. She continues, ‘The irony was not lost on the carvers, but the economic hardship made it necessary to be buyer orientated’ and therefore subject to the white fashions, social mores and demand of the time (1996: 12). This suggestion that noble savage, fauna and pastoral scenes and motifs were mostly European influenced leaves little room for Indigenous agency or perspective as to choice of representations. Kleinert similarly speaks of the production of emu eggs as being part of an Aboriginal economy, however she takes the view that the production of emu eggs and other crafts ‘far from representing a form of cultural colonization…might be seen as a form of strategic resistance that successfully disrupted the disciplined approach to regular, dutiful labour favoured by government authorities’ (2000:244-245).

Kleinert further suggests that although some of the depictions were drawn from the ‘vernacular art form popular among itinerant workers from the mid-nineteenth century onward’, the makers ‘also drew upon the cultural memories embodied in rock art imagery [and] the skills acquired in carved wooden weapons’ (2000:244). She adds that ‘in all cases, whether the forms outwardly resemble earlier traditions or appropriate – in a form of bric-a-brac – from a colonial genre, they do so from a culturally distinctive, Indigenous perspective’ (Kleinert 2000:245). Here the exercise of Aboriginal agency is emphasised. One must remember that Aboriginal people in western NSW have a close historical involvement in the pastoral industry. This continues to generate feelings of recognition and pride (cf. Beckett 2005; Cowlishaw 2004; MacDonald 2002; McGrath 1987). Whilst there may have been a certain level of irony in some of the more traditional depictions, and whilst the sale of carving was, as one artist said, ‘our survival’ and therefore an economic necessity, I consider that the irony of which Martin speaks is a more recent and reflexive re-figuring of some of these past depictions. This has seen change in how these depictions are being interpreted and considered, as well as re-interpretations of what historically motivated their choosing.

Beckett points out that in Wilcannia in the 1950s, children felt ashamed of anything which was seen to be part of ‘the old ways’: like speaking the lingo, or singing or dancing the old songs, increasingly disregarding ‘the traditional culture [and placing] a negative valuation on some of its features’ (1958:93-95). However, as Aboriginal people in Wilcannia have increasingly experienced an awakened interest in ‘our tradition’, native animals and noble savage images have become depictions of choice. These are part of an inter- and intra-cultural process to educate self and Other and are a source of pride.

There do not appear to be any recent depictions of cattle mustering or bucking broncos despite the history of Aboriginal involvement in this industry. Aboriginal people rode, tamed and talked of bucking horses. These were the lived practices of Aboriginal cultural life for many people. Their absence from contemporary art works should be considered not only in terms of the fact that few ringer/drover positions exist any more, but, also in terms of a politics that requires the demonstration of continuous ‘tradition’ to gain rights to land. Further, the value placed on ideas of Aboriginal cultural tradition continues, if less overtly, to negate as spurious that which is ‘touched’ by white influence, including images of bucking broncos. Badger Bates, who has been carving eggs since he was a small boy said, ‘When I kicked off carving [eggs], I was just doing bullocks and that, because I worked on stations and rode in rodeos. All the old people used to wear R. M. Williams – silk shirts, big hats – men and women’. It was only much later in the early eighties, when Badger saw the engravings, carvings and stencils of his ancestors at Mutawintji National Park for the first time, that he said he thought to himself, ‘I’m going to change all this [carving bullocks, etc]… when I saw Mutawintji, I felt, this is not right carving foreign animals. Emu, porcupine, kangaroo – they my food. They what helped me in my life’.
Badger said he then began to reflect on his early experiences as a child and of the stories and ways he had been taught. He says he considers that riding horses in rodeos is also part of him and his life, and therefore part of his ‘culture’ of the time. However, access to Mutawintji and information about his ‘people’, together with the identity politics and discourses of the 1970s and 1980s have arguably concatenated to construct a belief that carving bullocks was not right; not part of an Aboriginal identity or a representation of Aboriginal culture that he wishes to either project or invest in. In terms of art representation, there has been a reflexive distancing from that which is not broadly understood to be part of a valued and understood form of Aboriginality or the wider public’s recognition of what constitutes Aboriginal art proper.

I asked Badger why he called his lino print ‘Life on the Darling’ (See Image 6.) when life on the Darling (according to my perception) was not like that depicted. He said, ‘We still hunt, we still eat wild meat, we still fish’. Whilst it is true that boomerangs are no longer used for hunting, people no longer live in ‘gunyas’ or ‘mia-mia’s’ (bark huts or bough shelters) and men and women no longer walk around either naked or wear the minimal coverings of their ancestors, the differences seem to be construed in terms of clothing, accoutrements and tools as opposed to a completely altered ontology. Although some ‘old ways’ are no longer practised in the same way, many are seen and experienced as being continuous, if taking different forms. Whilst a reductionist argument could interpret this differently, these depictions and the expressions made about these depictions are an explicit means of maintaining a particular identity. They reflect an ontological view which sees persistence in certain practices as well as a reflexive thinking about culture. They are part of a political and cultural moment which draws upon art to teach, to re-think, to re-make, to reproduce, to continue culture – to consider the past and the present ways of life as well as future directions and aspirations.

Culture, and what this means has taken on a new impetus and a new importance in the lives of many Aboriginal people in Wilcannia and artists now express this through particular representations and subjects. There are clearly cultural limits to cultural production and shifting recognitions of what does or will acceptably constitute culture for both blackfellas and whitefellas. For a group of people, many of whom feel ‘strong’ in culture but for whom certain factors mitigate the possibility of living and doing as they might wish, art allows for a remembering and expressing of that which is denied – for example, access to privately owned land and barriers created by current lifestyle and living conditions. As Barkindji people have lost much access to country, art is one form of expressing how lost access to elements of country can be held onto and lived through depiction. In talking about the Inuit, Berlo states that, ‘For many artists, drawing the old ways rather than continuing to follow them is a way of maintaining identity’ (1999:91). To draw, paint or carve aspects of a camp site, a water hole no longer visited or a favourite activity no longer practised, compels an affective sensoria. Memories of places, people and events, the smells and feelings are drawn from operant conditioning to be ‘present’ in the act of re-presentation. The art work resonates, strikes a chord not only for the artist but also for those who are privy to the artist’s exposition of the work. This is not to promote an essentialist continuity of ‘tradition’, nor am I suggesting that somehow culture is consolidating itself in a way of life no longer ‘present’ or ‘practised’. There is a noticeable strong and culturally accepted individual biographic element to many art works. ‘Finding my Way’ by Barney Williams, ‘My Story by Willie-Don Hunter’, ‘Nan and Pop Coming to Wilcannia’ by Murray Butcher and ‘Me Fishing in the Darling’ by Badger Bates all speak to the importance of present cultural identity and memory. Clearly ‘culture is a continuing construction which both organizes and emerges from people’s behaviour’ (MacClancy 1997:3). What I am saying is that Aboriginal culture has for many Aboriginal people in Wilcannia become a more self-conscious matter; and art, at once, prompts and is a tangible expression of this consciousness.

CONCLUSION

I am not claiming that the art being made in Wilcannia and Broken Hill, and the responses to this, is a Barkindji wide phenomenon. This is a geographically specific ethnography offering a local example of the way in which cultural brokers, who, importantly are popular within their own communities, generate cultural capital with discernable effects. It would be incorrect to say that the only or even the primary driver of all of the artists is a desire to ‘prove’ an Aboriginal identity or the possession of Aboriginal culture to other Aboriginal people, to Others or to the self. Nevertheless, I suggest that the extent to which artists say that art works show culture and demonstrate culture in some way references a desire to indicate some tangible expression of this thing called Aboriginal and particularly Barkindji culture in ways which both Aboriginal people and dominant society understand. Here identity is seen to be re-produced, re-constructed and re-presented in an interactive process with and through both people and things. Art and culture and their importance become relational. That is, art and culture and how these categories are constructed and perceived are about relationships: relationships between people and relationships between people and things (Gibson 2008).

Art objects are a part of Aboriginal ‘self-production’ (Myers 1991:28). For many of the Aboriginal artists and indeed for others who do not make art in Wilcannia, art has become a mirror and avenue through which identity and culture are visually and discursively expressed, reflected upon and explored (Gibson 2008). People here clearly recognise art’s potentiality as an instrument of discursive advocacy, identity and agency (Gunew and Rizvi 1994; MacClancy 1997; Phillips and Steiner 1999). While the associated discourses are fluid, diverse and multiple (Hall and du Gay 1996; Myers 1994) thereby allowing the potential for a dynamic synergy, this is tempered by cultural broker direction and dissemination.
of what is seen to properly constitute a Barkindji style. Given the willing uptake of cultural broker advice by Barkindji artists in Wilcannia, Broken Hill (and to some extent those Barkindji from Wilcannia living in Sydney) the influence might be considered a successful dissemination. There is some ambiguity here, however, which is echoed in some cultural brokers’ own ambivalence towards whitefella expectations of what is thought to properly constitute Aboriginal art and the restrictions that this places on individual artistic freedom.

History demonstrates that Aboriginal people ‘have frequently manipulated commodity production in order to serve economic needs as well as new demands for self-representation and self-identification made urgent by the establishment of colonial hegemonies’ (Phillips and Steiner 1999:3). Aboriginal people in Wilcannia recognise art’s power to engage in these discourses and to communicate cultural values and concerns, as well as art’s potential to be less confrontational than other more direct action and expression.

People in Wilcannia create art works for many reasons social, cultural, economic and political. This is indeed part of the point I am making. As with all cultures, people in Wilcannia ‘can be observed to project multiple, inconsistent self-representations that are context dependent and may shift rapidly’ (Ewing 1990:251). These varying representations and the artists that I have engaged with ‘speak’ to and of the complexities of what constitutes and is made to constitute Aboriginal (with particular reference to Barkindji) identity and culture. The works and the artists do this in complex ways. Nevertheless, because of Aboriginal art’s close association with valued ideas of Aboriginal culture the making of art together with the sale of art works can be thought politically salient. Aboriginal art and artefacts have become embroiled in a multiplicity of roles and regimes of value including ‘as an expression of personal and community identity with the majority culture’ (Kleinert 1994:185). There is no doubt that Aboriginal art’s ubiquity with ideas of Aboriginal culture has seen art making become something of a visual and verbal and cultural imperative to the Barkindji people of Wilcannia – people who are most often portrayed as having no culture to see or speak of.
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NOTES

1. The Barkindji speaking peoples were historically known as different groups, and ranged from Bourke in the north to Wentworth in the south: ‘all spoke what were basically dialects of the same language’ (Hercus 1993:3). These river groups including those from the Paroo and Warrego rivers are now referred to collectively as Barkindji (Hercus 1993: 3). The traditional owners of Wilcannia are the Barkindji people and it is the art of those who identify as Barkindji to which this paper attends.

2. Wilcannia is a small country town in far western New South Wales. Official Australian Bureau of Statistics figures give the Wilcannia area population as 685 of whom 64% are Indigenous. However, the town proper is unofficially thought to be closer to 550 with 500 Indigenous (Bill O’Brien, General Manager Central Darling Shire Council 2007).

3. The CDEP is a government initiative which seeks to generate sustainable employment for Aboriginal people. Known colloquially as ‘work for the dole’, people in Wilcannia work an average of two or three days per
week and gain 'top ups' to their social security payments. This work includes projects relating to building and town maintenance, art making and a women's sewing group. Austin-Broos (2003:120) describes the CDEP as a 'subsidized alternative to the dole that originated in remote communities when elders negotiated with the government for ways to prevent their unemployed young from simply receiving 'sit down money'. During 2004, there were forty two people working for CDEP in Wilcannia.

4. Reasons for the close of Kaathiri centre vary. Most of the Aboriginal people asked said that they did not really know what happened, although some reasons given were: the centre just 'ran out of money', there was too much in-fighting ('tribal fighting'), or people not looking after the brushes and wasting paints. Another reason given was that 'every time they got a stockpile of art together to sell, the kids broke in and vandalised the place and people just said stuff it'. Others, mostly whitefellas, gave reasons such as poor administration, 'interclan rivalry', 'poor stock control and ordering', together with certain people 'cream off the profits'.

5. Aboriginal people in Wilcannia call the echidna 'porcupine' for the most part.

6. Whilst tracking the heritage of these mostly unsigned eclectic range of paintings would be an interesting case, this is for another time. Some of these works are undated and unsigned; therefore, I am relying on best estimates from people in town as to the date of many of the works. Some show dates in the early eighties. Some of these works are interesting for their obvious use of 'dotting' as background.

7. The making of intricately carved whip handles is linked to the pastoral industry and the strong Aboriginal connection to it. There is a splendid example of a carved whip handle made between the 1920s and 1940s by Harry Mitchell, a Barkindji man, which is held in the Australian Museum in Sydney.

8. Archaeologist Sarah Martin states that emu eggs were used as containers pre-contact although it is not known if they were carved as they are post-contact (Martin 1996:12). Kleinert gives the earliest date of a post contact carved emu egg as late nineteenth century (1994: 188).

9. Although many of the objects are said to have been made for sale to whitefellas, some older as well as more recent works are held by families. I saw some carved emu eggs made in 1979 and a few carved wooden shields, boomerangs, spears and nulla nullas from the early eighties in family homes and on the wall of the local public house. Today, most homes in Wilcannia have art works made by relatives on display. Acrylic paintings, clap-sticks, boomerangs and carved and painted emu eggs predominate. It is difficult to precisely date many of these objects.

10. Beckett, talking about the interaction of black and white in the Far West in the 1950s, said that, 'Few whites show any interest in becoming involved in aboriginal affairs, and they are not always ready to allow aborigines to become involved in their own affairs' (2005:33).

11. Those Barkindji people who advocate a Barkindji 'style' consider it a compliment if their designs are copied by other Barkindji but draw the line at 'other' language groups using them.

12. This woman (who lived mostly in Broken Hill), was one of only two women I met who was gaining or had received some formalised art-training in a dominant society institution.

13. Emu egg carving is not readily practised today by many people under about fifty years of age. Younger people prefer to 'paint' scenes and subjects on the eggs as it is much quicker and there is less chance of breaking the fragile egg through the thinning of shell layers. This does not seem to have anything to do with availability of eggs. One station holder told me that Aboriginal people can, at times, collect 300 eggs in one day on his property. Hunting and collecting eggs as a cultural activity including for food still occurs (Martin 1996:12).

14. Although Martin does not specify an exact period of time, a guide of between 1950 and 1980 might be deduced.
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